

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-12 and 14-16 are now pending in the application. Claims 2, 7, 9 and 13 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet" Figure 2 has been labeled as "Prior Art" as suggested by the Examiner. As such, the drawings should now overcome the objection. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Specifically, the term "corner portions" has been added to the specification. This addition does not constitute new matter, as the feature was initially disclosed in the specification as "interfaces" and is clearly shown in the original drawings. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 5-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubiel (U.S. Pat. No. 4,513,827, hereinafter "Dubiel") in view of

Maurer (UK1014081, hereinafter, "Maurer"). Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubiel in view of Maurer and in further view of Chaconas (U.S. Pat. No. 5,910,197, hereinafter, "Chaconas"). Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubiel in view of Maurer and in further view of Chaconas or Figure 2 of the present application. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that independent claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended to include a generally tapered transition portion from the head to the body of the anvil having a stop formed thereon. None of the references cited by the Examiner appear to show this feature. The Examiner asserts that the tapered surface of the output shaft in Dubiel serves as a stop. Dubiel does not appear to teach or suggest that the tapered surface serves as a stop. Even if this was considered to be a stop, it is itself a tapered surface and does not teach a stop located on a tapered transition portion.

The Examiner has further noted that Chaconas discloses a series of stops. While the driving lugs of Chaconas may act as stops when used with a conventional socket, there are no recesses in the anvil disclosed in Chaconas. Further, the driving lugs of Chaconas are not stops on a tapered transition surface nor does Chaconas suggest such a feature. The present application includes stops on a tapered transition portion that allow a socket to overlap a recess portion. Chaconas does not appear to teach or suggest these stops, nor does there appear to be any motivation to include recesses with the stops. "The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23

USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992)(citing In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USPQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

As such, Applicants believe claims 1, 8, and 12, as amended, to be in condition for allowance. Claims 3-6, 10-11 and 14-16 depend from claims 1, 8 and 12, respectively. As such, these claims should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-12 and 14-16 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 23, 2005
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

RWM/JMP

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 2. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-5, replaces the original sheets including Figures 1-5.

Attachment: 3 Replacement Sheets